REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15 and 16 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 2 has been canceled by this amendment.

I.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 1-5, 9, 12, 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) in view of Corvin (US 2001/0054181).

Claim 1, as amended, recites that the broadcast wave includes a limit flag which lim its judgment of said judging unit, wherein said judging unit is operable to judge, when said receiving unit receives the limit flag while said display unit displays the broadcast contents, that the broadcast contents indicated by the stream information should be continuously displayed after the reception of the limit flag regardless of a user's operation. Applicants respectfully submit that Kwoh and Corvin do not teach or suggest at least the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1.

With respect to Kwoh, Applicants note that this reference discloses a display device having parental control features, in which it is possible to block a video display, and replace the video display with textual data (see Abstract and col. 16, lines 15-19). For example, as explained in Kwoh, during the time that PG-13 rated video data is being blocked, textual data is displayed on the screen which describes what is happening in the video program (see col. 16, lines 22-28).

Based on the foregoing description, Applicants note that while Kwoh discloses the ability to replace video data with textual data, that Kwoh does not disclose or suggest the above-noted

11

features recited in amended claim 1 which indicate that the broadcast wave includes a limit flag which limits judgment of said judging unit, wherein said judging unit is operable to judge, when said receiving unit receives the limit flag while said display unit displays the broadcast contents, that the broadcast contents indicated by the stream information should be continuously displayed after the reception of the limit flag regardless of a user's operation.

With respect to Corvin, Applicants note that this reference discloses a method for forced advertising, in which an advertisement is forcedly presented to a viewer (see Abstract). For example, as explained in Corvin, the playing of a forced advertisement may include preventing the viewer from switching channels, or preventing the user from turning off the user equipment (see paragraph [0024]).

Regarding the above-noted disclosure in Corvin, Applicants note that in the Office Action, the Examiner has taken the position that the forced advertisements in Corvin are "limit information" (see Office Action at the bottom of page 3). As noted above, however, claim 1 has been amended so as indicate that the broadcast wave includes a limit flag which limits judgment of said judging unit, wherein said judging unit is operable to judge, when said receiving unit receives the limit flag while said display unit displays the broadcast contents, that the broadcast contents indicated by the stream information should be continuously displayed after the reception of the limit flag regardless of a user's operation.

In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that the forced advertisements of Corvin clearly do not correspond to a "limit flag" as recited in amended claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Corvin does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-

noted features recited in amended claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kwoh and Corvin does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious all of the features recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

In addition, Applicants note that claim 1 has also been amended so as to recite the features of a function processing unit operable to activate and terminate a predetermined function based on a user's operation, wherein said judging unit is operable to judge that the broadcast contents should not be displayed when the predetermined function is activated before the limit flag is received, and judge that the broadcast contents should be displayed when the predetermined function is terminated before the limit flag is received, and wherein said function processing unit is further operable to cause, when the predetermined function has been activated, said display unit to display a function processing image generated by the predetermined function instead of the broadcast contents.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kwoh and Corvin do not teach or suggest the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1.

For example, with respect to Kwoh, as described above, this reference discloses a display device having parental control features, in which it is possible to block a video display, and replace the video display with textual data (see Abstract and col. 16, lines 15-19). In this regard, as explained in Kwoh, an authorized user of the system is able to enable/disable a blocking function which prevents certain broadcast contents from being displayed (see Figs. 8-11 and col.

13

9, lines 4-8).

Regarding the above-noted disclosure in Kwoh, Applicants note that in the Office Action, the Examiner has taken the position that the ability for a user in Kwoh to enable/disable the blocking function corresponds to the claimed "predetermined function" (see Office Action at page 4 with respect to the rejection of original claim 2).

With respect to this position, Applicants note that that while Kwoh discloses the ability to enable/disable the blocking function, thereby allowing/disallowing certain broadcast contents from being displayed, that such an ability does not correspond to the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1 which indicate that said judging unit is operable to judge that the broadcast contents should not be displayed when the predetermined function is activated before the limit flag is received, and judge that the broadcast contents should be displayed when the predetermined function is terminated before the limit flag is received, wherein said function processing unit is further operable to cause, when the predetermined function has been activated, said display unit to display a function processing image generated by the predetermined function instead of the broadcast contents.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Kwoh does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Corvin does not cure these deficiencies of Kwoh. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 3-5 and 9 depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 12, Applicants note that this claim has been amended so as to recite that the transmission unit is operable to transmit, included in the broadcast wave, a <u>limit flag</u> which imposes a limitation on a display of broadcast contents so that the <u>display of the broadcast contents is forced to continue</u>.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kwoh and Corvin does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in amended claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 12 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Applicants note that each of these claims has been amended to recite that the broadcast wave includes a <u>limit flag</u> which limits judgment in said judging step, wherein in said judging step, (i) when the <u>limit flag</u> is received in said receiving step while the broadcast contents are displayed in said display control step, it is judged that the broadcast contents indicated by the stream information should be continuously displayed after the reception of the limit flag regardless of a user's operation, and (ii) when the <u>predetermined function is activated before the limit flag is received</u>, it is judged that the broadcast contents <u>should not be displayed</u>, and when the <u>predetermined function is terminated before the limit flag is received</u>, it is judged that the broadcast contents <u>should be displayed</u>, and wherein in said function processing step, <u>when the predetermined function has been activated</u>, the display unit is caused to <u>display a function processing image generated by the predetermined function instead of the broadcast contents</u>.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kwoh and Corvin does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claims 15 and 16. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 15 and 16 are patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

B. Claims 6 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) and Corvin (US 2001/0054181), and further in view of Tsukagoshi (US 5,684,542).

Claim 6 depends from claim 1, and claim 13 depends from claim 12. Applicants submit that Tsukagoshi fails to cure the deficiencies of Kwoh and Corvin, as discussed above, with respect to amended claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 6 and 12 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

C. Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) and Corvin (US 2001/0054181), and further in view of Palmer (US 5,195,135).

Claim 7 depends from claim 1. Applicants submit that Palmer fails to cure the deficiencies of Kwoh and Corvin, as discussed above, with respect to amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 7 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

D. Claims 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) and Corvin (US 2001/0054181), and further in view of Lee et al. (US 2001/0049296).

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1. Applicants submit that Lee fails to cure the deficiencies of Kwoh and Corvin, as discussed above, with respect to amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 10 and 11 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

II.   Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kohei YAMAGUCHI et al.

/Kenneth W. Fields/
By: 2009.03.09 14:25:25 -04'00'
    Kenneth W. Fields
    Registration No. 52,430
    Attorney for Applicants

KWF/krg
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 9, 2009